RELEASED IN FULL

-5-

Friday, 6/10/94

be working with the U.N. and the OAS to ensure that the human rights monitoring will continue under the ICM -- the International Civilian Mission. In addition, the Embassy will continue to monitor and report on human rights issues, generally.

Q Did I understand correctly, Christine, that the withdrawal of Embassy personnel was at least in part due to security problems within the country of Haiti, the security of Embassy personnel? Or is it simply an action of protest?

MS. SHELLY: No, it's not an action of protest. It is an action taken specifically in connection with the new sanctions, which were announced by the President today.

Any other questions on this? Okay. Alan, it's all yours.

in Rwanda? How would you describe the events taking place

MS. SHELLY: Based on the evidence we have seen from observations on the ground, we have every reason to believe that acts of genocide have occurred in Rwanda.

Q What's the difference between "acts of genocide" and "genocide?"

MS. SHELLY: As you know, there is a legal definition of this. There has been a lot of discussion about how the definition applies under the definition of "genocide" contained in the 1948 convention. If you're looking at that for your determination about genocide, clearly, not all of the killings that have taken place in Rwanda are killings to which you might apply that label.

Some of the difficulties over actually arriving at a definition of "genocide" and formulations on genocide are the reasons why -- particularly, in late May, the U.N. Human Rights Commission, with the very strong support by the United States, appointed a Special Rapporteur for Rwanda, specifically to compile the information on possible violations of human rights and on acts which constitute breaches of international humanitarian law and crimes against humanity, including acts of genocide.

His preliminary report, which is due later this month, will provide the additional information about the human rights violations — the types, and presumably how they might be characterized — and that is something that we have to wait for.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE REVIEW AUTHORITY: CHARLES L. DARIS DATE/CASE ID: 31 JAN 2002 199903054

UNCLASSIFIED

gen gen

Friday, 6/10/94

As to the distinctions between the words, we're trying to call. What we have seen so far, as best as we can, and based, again, on the evidence, we have every reason to believe that acts of genocide have occurred.

Q How many acts of genocide does it take to make genocide?

MS. SHELLY: Alan, that's just not a question that I'm in a position to answer.

Q Well, is it true that you have specific guidance not to use the word "genocide" in isolation but always to preface it with these words "acts of"?

MS. SHELLY: I have guidance which I try to use as best as I can. There are formulations that we are using that we are trying to be consistent of our use of. I don't have an absolute categorical prescription against something, but I have the definitions. I have phraseology which has been carefully examined and arrived at as best as we can apply to exactly the situation and the actions which have taken place.

Q Christine, I've noticed the wording from yesterday to today has changed somewhat. Yesterday it was "acts of genocide may have occurred," and now you're saying, "We believe they're likely to occur." Has there been a change from yesterday to today on our view of that situation?

MS. SHELLY: I don't know if there has been a change in our view. This is after careful examination by a lot of those who are involved in very careful tracking of this, including also the lawyers, because there are obligations which arise in connection with the use of the term.

NO

When I gave the formulation at the outset, that's the formulation that we have all agreed accurately reflects the situation and our understanding of it.

Well, what is an act of genocide, Christine?

MS. SHELLY: As defined in the 1948 Genocide Convention, the crime of genocide occurs when certain acts are committed against members of a national, ethnic, racial or religious group with the intent of destroying that group in whole or in part.

The relevant acts include killing, causing serious bodily or mental harm and deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction of the group.

-7-

Friday, 6/10/94

Q Wait a minute. You said genocide --

MS. SHELLY: This is the definition in the 1948 convention.

Q Of genocide.

MS. SHELLY: Of genocide.

Q You say genocide happens when certain acts happen, and you say that these acts have happened in Rwanda, so why can't you say that genocide has happened?

MS. SHELLY: Because, Alan, there is a reason for the selection of words that we have made, and I'm not a lawyer. I don't approach this from the international legal and scholarly point of view. We try best as we can to accurately reflect a description and in particularly addressing that issue, the issue is out there. People have obviously been looking at it.

We had said consistently prior to that that we believed that acts of genocide may have occurred in Rwanda, and we strongly supported full investigation and documentation of those crimes against humanity with a view to being able to make not only the evaluation of itself but to be able to describe it as accurately as we can.

And, as I said, I've told you what the language is on this at this point and also where we are vis-a-vis actions -- with support for the actions of the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva and their decision to send this team of the human rights of officers headed by a special rapporteur to investigate and document those breaches precisely for the view to be able to make any other determinations that we might need to make.

Q Christine, as a signatory to the convention, is the United States required to do anything once it has established that acts of genocide have occurred?

MS. SHELLY: The issue as to what obligations it might entail for the U.S. Government, as you know, the U.S. has strongly supported the introduction of a peacekeeping force in Rwanda as soon as possible to try to protect the individuals at risk and to assist in this supply of humanitarian assistance.

The U.N. has commitments on the part of ten nations to provide troops for this operation. The U.S. is going to assist with that in financial, logistical and material support.

Friday, 6/10/94

We believe that this international force is the proper response to protect the individuals at risk. In addition to that, as we said, because of the facts of the situation, certainly the most recent ones that have come out, it's the reason why we are also pursuing this via the United Nations Rights Commission and the decision specifically to send the human rights officers to there in order to be able to do the investigations and the necessary documentation in order to evaluate the breaches of international law and crimes against humanity which includes the acts of genocide.

- Q Does something follow? Are there war crimes or genocidal war crime procedures?
- MS. SHELLY: There can be investigations of this. I understand that parties to the convention can also call upon competent U.N. organs to take appropriate actions with a view to preventing and suppressing acts of genocide. Under the convention also, the prosecution of persons charged with genocide is the responsibility of competent courts in the state where the acts took place, or alternately it can be by a competent international tribunal.

So those are possibilities which might emerge, presumably after the report comes in from the U.N. High Commissioner -- their experts who are going.

- Q What does the State Department think of Canada's decision yesterday to penalize American fishermen in Canadian waters on the West Coast? Is this a legal action?
- MS. SHELLY: I have not had time to prepare a response on that yet. We have seen the statements that were made yesterday in Canada by this. I expect that I'll actually be issuing a statement on this later this afternoon.
- Q Korea. Do you have any announcement about the United States acceptance of the Russian proposal of international conference?

MS. SHELLY: No. I don't have anything new on the Russian proposal at all. Secretary Christopher was meeting with Foreign Minister Kozyrev in Istanbul, as you know. That was taking place earlier today. I unfortunately do not have a readout on that meeting, and so I haven't had a chance. I don't know what was said in their comments to their press afterwards, so if they've addressed that — in any case I don't know whether they did, and so I can't tell you that. But if they have addressed that, I wouldn't be likely to be adding anything beyond what the Secretary said anyway.